

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

-----X  
GREGORY EDWARDS,

Plaintiff,

Index No.:

-against-

CITY OF NEW YORK, POLICE OFFICER CHARLES  
LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, AND  
SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS  
ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT,

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT**

Defendants.

-----X

Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS by and through his attorneys, TRACIE A. SUNDACK  
& ASSOCIATES, L.L.C., complaining of Defendants CITY OF NEW YORK, POLICE  
OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL  
UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT respectfully  
alleges as follows:

1. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK was and  
still is a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the General  
Municipal Law of the State of New York.

2. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, its agents  
servants and employees operated, maintained and controlled the New York City Police  
Department, including all the police officers thereof.

3. Upon information and belief, that at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant  
POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, was employed by  
Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK as a police officer.

4. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant POLICE OFFICER CHARLES  
LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, acted within the scope of his employment for  
Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK.

5. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant POLICE OFFICER CHARLES

LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, was acting under the color and pretense of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs, and usages of the County and City of New York, and under the authority of his office as police officer for said city and county.

6. Upon information and belief, that at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT were employed by Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK as police officers.

7. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT acted within the scope of their employment for Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK.

8. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT were acting under the color and pretense of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs, and usages of the County and City of New York, and under the authority of their office as police officers for said city and county.

9. That on April 30, 2012, at approximately 5:00 p.m., Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was in a motor vehicle lawfully stopped at or near the intersection of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street and Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Boulevard in the County, City, and State of New York.

10. That on the aforementioned date, time and place, Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK its agents, servants and/or employees including Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, approached Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS' vehicle and ordered Plaintiff to show them his driver's license, insurance card, and registration information.

11. That, on the aforementioned date, time and place, after Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS complied with said request, Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, ordered Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS to exit the vehicle. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS complied and, after exiting the vehicle,

both Plaintiff and the motor vehicle in which he had been traveling, were searched by Defendants. Thereafter, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was handcuffed and placed under arrest for Unlawful Possession of Marijuana, Criminal Possession of Marijuana, Unlawful Possession of a Knife in a Public Place, and Disorderly Conduct, despite Defendants' knowledge that they lacked reasonable grounds or probable cause to do so.

12. That Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was transported to the 32<sup>nd</sup> Precinct (250 West 135<sup>th</sup> Street, New York, New York 10030) of the New York City Police Department where he was subjected to an unlawful "strip-search", and thereafter transported to central booking where his arrest was processed.

13. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT initiated criminal proceedings against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS despite Defendants' knowledge that they lacked probable cause to do so.

14. That Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was held, detained and imprisoned by Defendants from approximately 5.00 p.m. on April 30, 2012, to approximately 9:00 p.m. on May 2, 2012, before being released from custody following the posting of bail.

15. That, as a result of the aforementioned unlawful acts of Defendants CITY OF NEW YORK, its agents, servants and/or employees including Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, on June 6, 2012, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was incarcerated on a parole violation, and remained incarcerated until he was released on June 29, 2012.

16. That on November 8, 2012, by Order of the Honorable K. McGrath, all charges against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS were dismissed (Docket Number 2012NY034649).

17. That on July 23, 2013, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS filed a Notice of Petition and Verified Petition in the Supreme Court of the State of New York (County of New York) seeking permission to file a late Notice of Claim in this matter. Plaintiff's Petition was assigned Index

Number 156694/2013, and is currently pending before the court.

18. This action is commenced within one year and ninety days after the cause of action arose.

19. This action falls within one or more of the exceptions set forth in CPLR §1602

**AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
FALSE ARREST UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

20. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates, and realleges each and every paragraph of this complaint and further alleges:

21. That at the aforementioned time and place, Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT placed Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS under arrest, despite Defendants' knowledge that they lacked probable cause to do so.

22. That Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS had not committed any offense and Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT did not have reasonable grounds or probable cause to believe that Plaintiff had committed any offense.

23. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT were aware that probable cause did not exist for the arrest and detention of Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS and that said arrest and detention was illegal, without justification or excuse, and without authority of law, and the Defendants acted with malicious intent to arrest, oppress, and injure Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS and such actions were committed in bad faith.

24. That, in all of the wrongful acts above alleged, Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, acted without reasonable or

probable cause and with malicious intent to arrest, oppress, and injure Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS and such actions were committed in bad faith.

25. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described unlawful and malicious acts of Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, all committed under color of their authority as police officers, and while acting in that capacity, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was deprived of the rights and immunities secured to him under the Constitutions and laws of the United States and of the State of New York, in particular the First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments thereof, and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, and 1985 (2) and (3), his liberty was restricted for an extended period of time, he was put in fear for his safety, and he was humiliated and subjected to handcuffing and other physical restraints, without probable cause.

26. As a further result of the above-described acts, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was deprived of the rights and immunities secured to him under the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of New York.

**AS AND FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
FALSE IMPRISONMENT UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

27. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates, and realleges each and every paragraph of this complaint and further alleges:

28. That Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was falsely imprisoned from April 30, 2012, to May 2, 2012, and again from June 6, 2012, to June 29, 2012, by Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, its agents, servants, and employees, including but not limited to Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, who procured and/or effected said false imprisonment knowing their actions to be wrongful and malicious and without any basis.

29. That Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK by and through its agents, servants, and employees, including but not limited to, Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES

LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT intended to confine Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS and Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS was conscious of the confinement, and Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS did not consent to the confinement.

30. That Defendants' words, actions, and the charges laid by them were willful, malicious, false, wrongful, without reason or basis and without probable cause and committed in bad faith and solely for the purpose of falsely imprisoning Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS and damaging Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS in his reputation and depriving him of his liberty.

31. That as a direct and proximate result of the above-described unlawful and malicious acts of Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, all committed under color of their authority as police officers for Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, and while acting in that capacity, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS suffered damage, all of which is in violation of his rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of New York.

**AS AND FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
MALICIOUS PROSECUTION UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

32. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates, and realleges each and every paragraph of this complaint and further alleges:

32. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT misrepresented and falsified evidence before the District Attorney.

34. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT did not make a complete and full statement of facts to the District Attorney.

35. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup>

PRECINCT withheld exculpatory evidence from the District Attorney.

36. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT were directly and actively involved in the initiation of criminal proceedings against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

37. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT lacked probable cause to initiate criminal proceedings against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

38. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT acted with malice in initiating criminal proceedings against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

39. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT were directly and actively involved in the continuation of criminal proceedings against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

40. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT lacked probable cause to continue criminal proceedings against Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

41. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT acted with malice in continuing criminal proceedings Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

42. That Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup>

PRECINCT misrepresented and falsified evidence throughout all phases of the criminal proceeding.

43. That, notwithstanding the perjurious and fraudulent conduct of Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, the criminal proceedings were terminated in Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS's favor.

**AS AND FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
MUNICIPAL LIABILITY**

44. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates, and realleges each and every paragraph of this complaint and further alleges:

45. Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, collectively and individually, while acting under color of state law, engaged in conduct that constituted a custom, usage, practice, procedure or rule of the respective municipality/authority, which is forbidden by the Constitution of the United States.

46. That the aforementioned customs, policies, usages, practices, procedures and rules of the City of New York and the New York City Police Department included, but were not limited to, wrongfully detaining minority males based on racial profiling and making unlawful arrests in order to satisfy an arrest quota.

47. The foregoing customs, policies, usages, practices, procedures and rules of the City of New York and the New York City Police Department constituted deliberate indifference to the safety, well-being and constitutional rights of Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

48. The foregoing customs, policies, usages, practices, procedures and rules of the City of New York and the New York City Police Department were the direct and proximate cause of the constitutional violations suffered by Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS as alleged herein.

49. The foregoing customs, policies, usages, practices, procedures and rules of the City of New York and the New York City Police Department were the moving force behind the



constitutional violations suffered by Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS as alleged herein.

50. Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, collectively and individually, while acting under the color of state law, were directly and actively involved in violating Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS's constitutional rights.

51. All of the foregoing acts by defendants deprived Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS of federally protected rights including, but not limited to, the right:

- A. Not to be deprived of liberty without due process;
- B. To be free from seizure and arrest not based on probable cause;
- C. To be free from unlawful search;
- D. To be free from unwarranted and malicious criminal prosecution;
- E. To be free from malicious abuse of process;
- F. Not to have cruel and unusual punishment imposed upon him;
- G. To receive equal protection under the law.

**AS AND FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
FAILURE TO INTERVENE**

52. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every allegation contained in this complaint.

53. Each and every individual Defendant Police Officer had an affirmative duty to intervene on Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS's behalf to prevent the violation of his constitutional rights and failed to so intervene despite having had a realistic opportunity to do so.

54. As a result of the aforementioned conduct of the individual Defendants, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS's constitutional rights were violated and he was subjected to excessive force and sustained physical injuries.

**AS AND FOR A SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
NEGLIGENT HIRING AND RETENTION**

55. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates, and realleges each and every paragraph of this complaint and further alleges:

56. That Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, was careless and reckless in hiring and retaining as and for its employees, Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, in that said Defendant employees lacked the experience, deportment and ability to be employed by Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK; in that Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK failed to exercise due care and caution in its hiring practices, and in particular, in hiring the defendant employees who lacked the mental capacity and the ability to function as employees of Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK; in that the Defendant employees lacked the maturity, sensibility and intelligence to be employed by Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK; in that Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK knew of the lack of ability, experience, deportment and maturity of said Defendant employees when they hired them to be employees; and, in that Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, its agents, servants and/or employees were otherwise careless, negligent and reckless.

57. Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK knew, or should have known in the exercise of reasonable care, the propensities of Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT to engage in the wrongful conduct heretofore alleged in this Complaint.

**AS AND FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
NEGLIGENT TRAINING AND SUPERVISION**

58. Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS repeats, reiterates, and realleges each and every paragraph of this complaint and further alleges:

59. The failure of Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK to adequately train, supervise, discipline or in any way control the behavior of Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, in the exercise of their employment functions, and their failure to enforce the laws of the State of New York and the regulations of Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, is evidence of the reckless lack of cautious regard for the


rights of the public including Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS. Further, the Defendants exhibited a lack of that degree of due care which prudent and reasonable individuals would show.

60. The failure of Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, to train, supervise, discipline or in any other way control Defendants POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, in the exercise of their employment functions and their failure to enforce the laws of the State of New York and the regulations of Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK, was carried out willfully, wantonly, maliciously and with such reckless disregard for the consequences as to display a conscious disregard for the dangers of harm and injury to the citizens of New York, including Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS.

61 As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS is entitled to compensatory damages in the sum of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) and is further entitled to punitive damages against the individual Defendants in the sum of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00)

**WHEREFORE** Plaintiff GREGORY EDWARDS demands judgment against Defendants CITY OF NEW YORK, POLICE OFFICER CHARLES LIEBERMAN, BADGE NUMBER 949834, and SEVERAL UNIDENTIFIED POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE 32<sup>ND</sup> PRECINCT, jointly and severally, in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) in compensatory damages and Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00) in punitive damages, plus reasonable attorney's fees, costs and disbursements of this action.

Dated: White Plains, New York  
July 23, 2013

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Tracie A. Sundack", is written over a horizontal line.

TRACIE A. SUNDACK & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
GREGORY EDWARDS  
19 Court Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
White Plains, New York 10601  
(914) 946-8100

**ATTORNEY'S VERIFICATION**

STATE OF NEW YORK                    }  
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER        } SS.:

I, the undersigned, an attorney admitted to practice in the Courts of the State of New York, state:

That I am the attorney of record for the Plaintiff in the within action.

That I have read the foregoing SUMMONS and COMPLAINT and know the contents thereof; the same is true to my own knowledge, except for the matters therein alleged to be on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true. The reason this Verification is made by me and not by the Plaintiff is that Plaintiff resides outside the County where your affirrant maintains her office. The grounds of my belief as to all matters not stated upon my own knowledge are as follows: files maintained by my office and conversations with Plaintiff.

I affirm that the foregoing statements are true, under the penalties of perjury.

Dated: White Plains, New York  
July 23, 2013

  
TRACIE A. SUNDACK